

REMARKS

Claims 15-29 are pending. All of the claims have been newly rejected under Section 103 based in whole or part on Muller (U.S. No. 6,286,349) in view of Gramckow (U.S. No. 6,697,699). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 15, the sole independent claim stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 in view of Muller and Gramckow, with the Examiner contending that the primary reference Muller discloses the feature of

“determining a desired flatness of the strip via a material flow model ...”

but neither Figure 4 nor any related text in the Muller reference discloses this subject matter. Applicant asks of the Examiner, where in the reference is there disclosure of a material flow model that determines a desired flatness of the strip? The text at col. 4 which discusses Figure 4 refers to a flatness control loop, which is apparently used in lieu of a model. There is no basis for reading the above-recited feature on a system that merely uses control loops.

Further, claim 15 (amended) is now further distinguished and non-obvious over the Examiner’s combination because the claim now requires a specific

... controlling a roll stand of the mill train via a strip shape model providing a relationship between intrinsic flatness i_p and visible flatness v_p and that uses the desired and actual flatness values as inputs to reduce the difference between the actual flatness and the desired flatness of the metal strip.”

In contrast, the Gramckow reference does not provide a strip shape model providing a relationship between intrinsic flatness i_p and visible flatness v_p . As noted at page 3 of the office action, the rejection relies on the Gramckow reference (at col. 2, line 59 - col. 3, line 11) for using desired and actual flatness values as inputs to reduce difference between actual and desired flatness, but this is not the same as using a model to provide a relationship between intrinsic flatness and visible flatness.

Applicant respectfully submits that the term “strip shape model” is defined in the specification (paragraphs 00041 - 00051). The prior art does not use a strip shape model.

In view of the discussion above, claim 15 is not obvious in view of the prior art. Furthermore, Claims 16-29 which depend from claim 15 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 15 as well as based on their own merits. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

Specifically applicant urges that the rejection of claim 26 based on Muller in view of Gramckow and in further view of Schmid appears deficient. The claim requires that strip flatness is determined via the strip shape model by applying an assumed temperature distribution. The citation from Schmid (col. 3, lines 15 – 45) does not allude to any such arrangement. The Examiner is requested to explain how the cited passage is being interpreted and applied to read on the recitation of claim 26. Applicant urges that claim 26 should be allowed.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: AUG. 13, 2009

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830